

Can gravitational dynamics be obtained by diffeomorphism invariance of action?

Sijie Gao*

Department of Physics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

Hongbao Zhang†

Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

Department of Physics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

CCAST (World Laboratory), P.O. Box 8730, Beijing, 100080, China

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

It has recently been suggested that the gravitational dynamics could be obtained by requiring the action to be invariant under diffeomorphism transformations. We argue that the action constructed in usual way is automatically diffeomorphism invariant in nature, which thus invalidates this alternative perspective to obtain gravitational dynamics. Especially, we also show what is wrong with the technical derivation of gravitational dynamics in the alternative approach.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Fy

As is well known, like any other classical field equation, Einstein's equation can also be established by the powerful variational principle. The corresponding action for gravity is the so called Einstein-Hilbert one plus the ever neglected surface term, i.e.,

$$S[g^{ab}] = \int_U R + 2 \int_{\partial U} K, \quad (1)$$

where R is the Ricci scalar and K is the trace of the extrinsic curvature of the boundary[1].

Recently, Padmanabhan suggested that Einstein's equation plus an undetermined cosmological constant can be derived from a new perspective[2, 3]. Later Sotiriou and Liberati reformulated this approach in [4]. Here is the outline of the reformulation in [4]. Let $f_\lambda : U \rightarrow U$ be a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms. Imposing the diffeomorphism invariance on this action, one has $S[g^{ab}] = S[(f_{\lambda*}g)^{ab}]$, where $f_{\lambda*}$ is the usual push-forward mapping associated with f_λ . Hence, for such variations, one obtains

$$0 = \frac{dS}{d\lambda} = \int_U \frac{\delta S}{\delta g^{ab}} \frac{dg^{ab}}{d\lambda} = \int_U \frac{\delta S}{\delta g^{ab}} \mathcal{L}_\xi g^{ab} = 2 \int_U \frac{\delta S}{\delta g^{ab}} \nabla^a \xi^b, \quad (2)$$

where ξ^b is the vector field, which generates f_λ , to be parallel to the boundary. Later, if one further requires $\mathcal{L}_\xi g^{ab}|_{\partial U} = 0$, i.e., $\nabla_a \xi_b + \nabla_b \xi_a|_{\partial U} = 0$, then $\frac{\delta S}{\delta g^{ab}}$ reduces to G_{ab} , which follows

$$0 = \int_U G_{ab} \nabla^a \xi^b = \int_U \nabla^a (G_{ab} \xi^b) - \int_U (\nabla^a G_{ab}) \xi^b = \int_{\partial U} G_{ab} n^a \xi^b - \int_U (\nabla^a G_{ab}) \xi^b, \quad (3)$$

where n_a is the normal vector field to the boundary. Now taking into account the fact that the above equation holds for arbitrary U and arbitrary vector field ξ^a except that it satisfies both $\xi^a n_a = 0$ and $\nabla_a \xi_b + \nabla_b \xi_a = 0$ on the boundary, the Bianchi identity can be obtained, i.e.,

$$\nabla^a G_{ab} = 0, \quad (4)$$

which implies

$$\int_{\partial U} G_{ab} \xi^a n^b = 0. \quad (5)$$

Especially, invoking ξ^a arbitrary, apart from being equal to the generator of so called Rindler horizon on the boundary, the authors of [4] claim that Eq. (5) leads to

$$G_{ab} = F(g)g_{ab}, \quad (6)$$

*Electronic address: sijie@bnu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: hzbzhang@pku.edu.cn

where $F(g)$ is some scalar depending on the metric. Furthermore, Using Eq. (4), and taking the covariant derivative of both sides of Eq. (6), one obtains $F(g) = \Lambda$, an undetermined cosmological constant. That is the sketch for the crucial point in [4].

However, we stress that the action (1) is manifestly independent of choice of coordinate system, which is the alternative representation for the automatical diffeomorphism invariance of the action in the passive viewpoint[1]. Therefore, the action constructed from any Lorentzian metric is automatically invariant under those diffeomorphisms mentioned before. Obviously, this Lorentzian metric has not to satisfy Einstein's equation plus an undetermined cosmological constant, which invalidates the alternative derivation of Einstein's equation by diffeomorphism invariance of the action[5]. Virtually, not only the action for gravity but also the action for matter fields is automatically invariant under such diffeomorphisms, which essentially originates from the fact that the involved fields are all formulated in terms of tensor fields on a manifold[1].

Now we would also like to identify the loophole in the derivation of [4]. Note that Eq. (5), which is essentially Eq. (17) in [4], is correct. The key question is whether any meaningful information can be extracted from it. The authors of [4] argued that Eq. (5) implies Eq. (6) that leads to the desired field equation. However, we shall show that Eq. (5) gives no information on the metric. Let ϵ_{abcd} and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{abc}$ be the volume elements on U and ∂U , respectively, such that the relation

$$\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_{abcd} = n_{[a}\tilde{\epsilon}_{bcd]} \quad (7)$$

holds[1]. Let $v^a = G^{ab}\xi_b$. Contracting v^a into both sides of Eq. (7) and restricting the resulting 3-forms to vectors only tangent to ∂U , one finds

$$\epsilon_{abcd}v^a = (n_a v^a)\tilde{\epsilon}_{bcd}. \quad (8)$$

Note that the right-hand side of Eq. (8) is just the integrand in Eq. (5). Let d be the derivative operator defined in [1], mapping a $p-1$ -form to a p -form. It is not difficult to show (see also [1]) that

$$d_e(\epsilon_{abcd}v^a) = (\nabla_a v^a)\epsilon_{ebcd}. \quad (9)$$

Using the Bianchi identity and the Killing equation satisfied by ξ^a , we have

$$\nabla_a v^a = \nabla_a (G^{ab}\xi_b) = 0. \quad (10)$$

This shows that the left-hand side of Eq. (8) is a closed form. According to the results in [6](see also [1]), such a form must be exact, i.e., there exists a form β_{cd} such that

$$\epsilon_{abcd}v^a = d_b\beta_{cd}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, the integrand of left-hand side of Eq. (5) is an exact form. Consequently, the integral vanishes if ∂U is a compact boundaryless surface (this is the case relevant to our discussion). Therefore, Eq. (5) always holds for any metric for which the Killing equation is satisfied on the boundary, and such nontrivial information as Eq. (6) on the metric can not be provided by Eq. (5).

In conclusion, this paper demonstrates that the alternative derivation of gravitational dynamics by diffeomorphism invariance of the action is infeasible. We accomplish it by both making it obvious that the diffeomorphism invariance of the covariant action holds automatically for any metric and pointing out the mistake made in the alternative derivation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Professor C. Liang for helpful discussions. S. Gao was supported in part by NSFC(No.10605006). H. Zhang was supported in part by NSFC(No.10533010).

-
- [1] R. M. Wald, General Relativity(The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984).
 - [2] T. Padmanabhan, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D14 2263(2005).
 - [3] T. Padmanabhan, gr-qc/0609012.
 - [4] T. P. Sotiriou and S. Liberati, Phys. Rev. D74 044016(2006).
 - [5] Although the arguments and results in [4] appear to be similar to those in [2] or [3], our criticisms in this paper do not apply to the latter due to some essential distinctions in their derivations.
 - [6] R. M. Wald, J. Math. Phys. 31 2378(1990).